



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/042,278

01/11/2002

Christian Ensel

1454.1212

5517

21171

7590

12/20/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/042,278	Applicant(s) ENSEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Victor Lesniewski	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 27-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 10/11/2004 has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, and 27-29 have been amended.
3. The objection to claim 29 is withdrawn in view of the amendment.
4. Claims 15-26 have been canceled.
5. Claims 1-14 and 27-29 are now pending.
6. The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 and 27-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the following new grounds of rejection.

Response to Amendment

7. Claims have been amended to clarify the dependences between devices and services in the system. The amendment proves a change in scope to the independent claims as the independent claims now explicitly state training activity parameters, determining possible dependences between devices and services, determining a normal range of dependence, and determining current activity parameters. However, none of the amended claims show a patentable distinction over the prior art as evidenced by the following new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-14 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waclawsky et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,974,457), hereinafter referred to as Waclawsky, in view of Ramanathan et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,286,047), hereinafter referred to as Ramanathan.

10. Waclawsky disclosed a system for monitoring data traffic for a data communications network that provides for the establishment and maintenance of a standard of operation. In an analogous art, Ramanathan disclosed a system for identifying and monitoring services on a communications network.

11. Concerning claims 1 and 27-29, Waclawsky did not explicitly state determining possible dependences between devices and services from the training activity parameters. Waclawsky's system determines training activity parameters, analyzes them in different ways, and uses certain properties to determine a normal range or standard of operation for the network. However, he is not specific in terms of properties that relate devices and services to each other. However, Ramanathan does explicitly disclose identifying dependencies among network services and the service elements or devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Waclawsky by adding the ability to determine possible dependences between devices and services from the training activity parameters as provided by Ramanathan. Here the combination satisfies the need a network monitoring system that can generate models of services based on dependencies among the services and service elements. See Ramanathan, column 3, lines 38-42. This rationale also applies to those dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

Art Unit: 2152

12. Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same except that they set forth the claimed invention as a device or a computer-readable storage medium are rejected under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

13. Thereby, the combination of Waclawsky and Ramanathan discloses:

- <Claims 1, 27, 28, and 29>

A method for computer-aided monitoring of a telecommunication network formed of devices capable of communication, said method comprising: determining training activity parameters, each describing activity of at least one of a corresponding device and a corresponding service (Waclawsky, column 4, lines 13-40); determining possible dependences between devices and services from the training activity parameters (Ramanathan, column 6, line 49 through column 7, line 25); determining from the possible dependencies a normal range of dependence for at least some of the devices and services in essentially undisturbed states to train a statistical estimator (Waclawsky, column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 4); determining current activity parameters, each describing activity of at least one of a corresponding device and a corresponding service (Waclawsky, column 4, lines 55-58); comparing the current activity parameters by the statistical estimator with the normal range of dependence (Waclawsky, column 5, lines 5-9); and determining from said comparing whether at least one of the devices and services in the telecommunication network has a communication performance different from the normal range of dependence in accordance with a predetermined criterion (Waclawsky, column 7, lines 28-34 and column 8, lines 31-38).

- <Claim 2>

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein at least some of the devices are constructed as terminals capable of communication (Ramanathan, column 3, lines 56-58).

- <Claim 3>

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the training activity parameters are determined within a predetermined time interval (Waclawsky, column 5, lines 59-64).

- <Claim 4>

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said determining of each training activity parameter is performed by the corresponding device (Ramanathan, column 4, lines 17-25), and wherein said method further comprises transmitting the training activity parameters to an administration unit which performs said comparing and determining based on said comparing (Waclawsky, column 4, lines 43-59).

- <Claim 5>

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said determining of each training activity parameter is performed by a training activity parameter determining unit separate from the corresponding device (Waclawsky, column 1, lines 34-55).

- <Claim 6>

The method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising determining communication-dependent dependences between at least some of the devices and services (Ramanathan, column 7, lines 5-13).

- <Claim 7>

The method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising determining possible directional dependences with regard to directions of communication between at least some of the devices and services (Waclawsky, column 2, lines 5-11).

- <Claim 8>

The method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising determining data of at least some of the devices and services, and wherein said determining of the training activity parameters is based on the data (Waclawsky, column 4, lines 13-40).

- <Claim 9>

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said determining of the training activity parameters uses all possible pairs of the devices and pairs of services (Ramanathan, column 6, lines 30-37).

- <Claim 10>

The method as claimed in claim 9, further comprising: storing the training activity parameters determined from the pairs of devices in a matrix; and determining the normal range of dependence from a structure of the matrix (Waclawsky, figure 4).

- <Claim 11>

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein at least one of the following parameters is determined as one of the training activity parameters data packets sent or received by the at least one of a corresponding device and a corresponding service, processor utilization of the corresponding device, a number of predetermined system function calls, and

existence of at least one of predetermined processes and predetermined computer programs (Waclawsky, column 5, lines 37-48).

- <Claim 12>

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein a neuro-fuzzy model is used as the statistical estimator (Waclawsky, column 8, lines 22-30 and column 16, lines 12-40).

- <Claim 13>

The method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising generating an alarm signal when at least one device in the telecommunication network differs from the normal range of dependence in accordance with the predetermined criterion (Waclawsky, column 7, line 60 through column 8, line 6).

- <Claim 14>

The method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising at least one of determining a disturbance of one of the devices in the telecommunication network; determining an unauthorized attempt to access one of the devices; and determining an unauthorized access attempt by one of the devices (Waclawsky, column 8, lines 31-38).

Since the combination of Waclawsky and Ramanathan discloses all of the above limitations, claims 1-14 and 27-29 are rejected.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

- Russell-Falla et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,266,664) disclosed a system for categorizing information content that utilizes a neural network feed-forward technique with a training dataset to aid in acquiring information content of a certain category.
- Ding et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,691,067) disclosed a system for estimating statistics concerning system metrics to provide for the accurate and efficient monitoring of a computer network.
- Torres (U.S. Patent Number 6,725,263) disclosed a system for analyzing traffic in a network that includes forecasting traffic transmitted to and from each of a plurality of nodes based on observed traffic statistics and an estimated growth.

15. The applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). The applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2152

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Victor Lesniewski
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2152



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER